



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,267	10/11/2007	Enrique Garrido-Gadea	L2012-7000US	9301
37462	7590	08/26/2010	EXAMINER	
LANDO & ANASTASI, LLP ONE MAIN STREET, SUITE 1100 CAMBRIDGE, MA 02142				LE, THIEN MINH
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2887				
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

docketing@LALaw.com  
gengelson@LALaw.com

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/591,267	GARRIDO-GADEA ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	THIEN M. LE	2887	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.  
 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.  
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 32-50 is/are pending in the application.  
 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
 6) Claim(s) 32 and 50 is/are rejected.  
 7) Claim(s) 33-49 is/are objected to.  
 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 31 August 2006 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
 a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____. 
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/6/2009</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____. 

## DETAILED ACTION

The preliminary amendment filed on 8/31/2006 has been entered. Claims 1-31 have been canceled. Claims 32-50 are presented for examination. The information disclosure statement filed on 7/6/2009 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to

consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 32 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cohen et al. (Cohen et al – 2004/0120101; herein after referred to as Cohen) in view of Savalle et al. (Savalle et al. - 5,915,016; referred to as Savalle).

**Regarding claims 32 and 50**, Cohen discloses a chip card module comprising:

- (i) a chamber for receiving a chip card (figures 1A, 1B, 1C – smart card reader 15);
- (ii) a card input slot for accessing for accessing the chamber (figures 1A, 1B, 1C);
- (iii) a plurality of conductors (34, figure 1C; 52, figure 2; par. 0019, 0023, 0024).

The claim differs in calling for a set of contacts in a card reader for contacting the contacts of a smart card. Though Cohen discloses a smart card reader, there is no specific reference in Cohen's teachings regarding the contacts. However, this claimed limitation is not new. Reference to Savalle is cited as an evident showing the conventionality of a card reader having a pluralities of contacts for contacting the contacts of a smart card (figure 1). It would have been obvious to incorporate the contacts as taught by Savalle in the system as taught by Cohen. The modification is merely a design consideration that is well within the skill levels and expectations of an ordinary skilled artisan. Furthermore, the modification extends Cohen's teachings of anti-tampering conductors to contact-type IC card reader module.

Regarding claim 2, see figure 1 of Savalle wherein the contacts of the inserting card are arranged in two rows. Thus, the contacts of the contacting modules would also

be arranged in two rows as shown in corresponding orders to connect to the contacts of the card.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

Claims 33-49 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art fails to disclose a chip card contact module having anti-tampering conductors as recited in claim 32 and further comprising the limitations of claims 33-49.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to THIEN M. LE whose telephone number is (571)272-2396. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:30am - 4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steve S. Paik can be reached on (571) 272-2404. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Thien M. Le/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2887